



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,861	10/22/2001	Hawley K. Rising III	080398.P432	1947

8791 7590 11/28/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

PATEL, MANGLES M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/044,861	Applicant(s) RISING ET AL.	
	Examiner Manglesh M. Patel	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>Apr 26, 2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: IDS filed on April 26, 2004 to the application filed on October 22, 2001.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 11, 14, 18, 22 and 26-28 are independent claims.
3. Acknowledgement is made to applicant's claim for priority to U.S. Application Serial No. 09/904271, filed on July 11, 2001 & U.S. Provisional Application Serial No. 60/242278, filed on October 20, 2000.

Drawings

4. The examiner has accepted the Drawings filed on October 22, 2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6 & 8-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaithilingam (U.S. 6,411,724, filed Jul 2, 1999) in view of Benitez (U.S. 6,847,980, filed Jun 30, 2000).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 8 & 11, Vaithilingam teaches *a computerized method of encoding multimedia content descriptions for a specific application domain comprising: obtaining an instance document that encodes the descriptions of multimedia content for a general application domain* (column 4, lines 66-67 & column 5, lines 1-20, wherein the multimedia content associated with descriptors are obtained and extracted.); Vaithilingam fails to teach the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. Benitez teaches *transforming the instance document from the general application domain to the specific application domain by mapping from a general application namespace to a specific application namespace* (column 12, lines 27-67, wherein the document represented by descriptors for the multimedia pertains to a generic and a specific descriptor. The mapping involves the general description of objects mapped to specific objects). Vaithilingam and Benitez are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of representing multimedia content with descriptors. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve clarity between distributed definitions by adding specific descriptors to generic objects. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Benitez with Vaithilingam for the benefits of allowing the mapping from a general domain to a specific domain using specific descriptors with generic objects.

Regarding Dependent claims 2, 9 & 12, Vaithilingam teaches *creating a binary instance document from the transformed instance document* (column 6, lines 45-65, wherein the meta-descriptor representing the content within the document is in a binary format).

Regarding Dependent claims 3, 10 & 13, Vaithilingam teaches *deriving a frequency table from the specific application namespace; and using the frequency table to encode the binary instance document* (column 8, lines 5-67, wherein a table representing the multimedia information is derived from the specific namespace representing content and is used with meta-descriptors. The descriptors are associated with the namespace using a binary format)

Regarding Dependent claims 4, Vaithilingam fails to teach the association between the specific and the general namespace. Benitez teaches *wherein the specific application namespace includes elements in the general application namespace* (See figure 8 & column 12, lines 5-27, wherein the specific objects include elements within the generic object namespace). Vaithilingam and Benitez are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of representing multimedia content with descriptors. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve clarity between distributed definitions by adding specific descriptors to generic objects. Therefore it

would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Benitez with Vaithilingam for the benefits of allowing the mapping from a general domain to a specific domain using specific descriptors with generic objects.

Regarding Dependent claim 5, Vaithilingam teaches *wherein the general application namespace is defined by a data description language specified by MPEG-7* (column 11, lines 4-46, wherein the multimedia data are described using MPEG-7).

Regarding Dependent claim 6, Vaithilingam fails to teach the use of a description language for describing the specific namespace. Benitez teaches *wherein the specific application namespace is defined by an application specific description language* (column 12, lines 27-67, wherein both the generic and specific object are represented by different meta-descriptors therefore the specific namespace is represented by a description language pertaining to a specific application namespace). Vaithilingam and Benitez are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of representing multimedia content with descriptors. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve clarity between distributed definitions by adding specific descriptors to generic objects. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Benitez with Vaithilingam for the benefits of allowing the mapping from a general domain to a specific domain using specific descriptors with generic objects.

Regarding Independent claim 14, 18 & 22, Vaithilingam teaches *creating, by the server, a binary instance document from the transformed instance document; and transmitting, by the server, the binary instance document to the client upon request from the client* (column 6, lines 45-65, wherein the created binary representation of the document described by binary meta-descriptors is transmitted to a client from the server). Vaithilingam fails to teach the transformation from a general domain to a specific domain. Benitez teaches *transforming, by a server, an instance document from a general application domain to the specific application domain, wherein the instance document encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in the general application domain* (column 12, lines 27-67, wherein the document represented by descriptors for the multimedia pertains to a generic and a specific descriptor. The mapping involves the general description of objects mapped to specific objects). Vaithilingam and Benitez are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of representing multimedia content with descriptors. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve clarity between distributed definitions by adding specific descriptors to generic objects. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Benitez with Vaithilingam for the benefits of allowing the mapping from a general domain to a specific domain using specific descriptors with generic objects.

Regarding Dependent claims 15, 21 & 25, Vaithilingam teaches *receiving, by the client, the binary instance document from the server; and recreating, by the client, the transformed instance document from the binary instance document* (column 6, lines 45-65, wherein the binary document represented by binary meta-descriptors is received by a client and decoded from the binary format).

Regarding Dependent claims 16, 19 & 23, Vaithilingam fails to teach the mapping of a general to a specific namespace. Benitez teaches *wherein transforming the instance document comprises: mapping from a general application namespace to a specific application namespace* (column 12, lines 5-67, wherein the mapping of a generic object to a specific object is described). Vaithilingam and Benitez are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of representing multimedia content with descriptors. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve clarity between distributed definitions by adding specific descriptors to generic objects. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Benitez with Vaithilingam for the benefits of allowing the mapping from a general domain to a specific domain using specific descriptors with generic objects.

Regarding Dependent claim 17, 20 & 24, Vaithilingam teaches *deriving, by the server, a frequency table from the specific application namespace; and using, by the server, the*

frequency table to encode the binary instance document (See fig 3 & column 8, lines 5-67, wherein a table representing the content description is shown. In addition the descriptors are represented in a binary format).

Regarding Independent claims 26-28, Vaithilingam teaches *receiving, by the client, a binary instance document* (column 6, lines 45-65, wherein the client receives the document with the binary encoded meta descriptors describing the multimedia content). However Vaithilingam fails to teach the transformation between the specific and general application domain. Benitez teaches *recreating, by the client, a transformed instance document from the binary instance document, wherein the transformed instance document encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in the specific application domain as a result of transforming an instance document that encodes the descriptions of multimedia content in a general application domain* (See figure 3 & column 12, lines 27-67, wherein the document represented by descriptors for the multimedia pertains to a generic and a specific descriptor. The mapping involves the general description of objects mapped to specific objects). Vaithilingam and Benitez are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of representing multimedia content with descriptors. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve clarity between distributed definitions by adding specific descriptors to generic objects. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Benitez with

Vaithilingam for the benefits of allowing the mapping from a general domain to a specific domain using specific descriptors with generic objects.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaithilingam (U.S. 6,411,724, filed Jul 2, 1999) in view of Benitez (U.S. 6,847,980, filed Jun 30, 2000) further in view of Huang (U.S. 6,593,936, filed Feb 1, 2000).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, Vaithilingam teaches the representation of multimedia content using meta-descriptors (Abstract). Vaithilingam fails to teach the transformation from a general application domain to a specific application domain. Benitez teaches the transformation using generic object and specific object representations for encoding multimedia content (column 12, lines 27-67). However Benitez fails to teach the use of an extensible markup language with a style-sheet for the representation of the table for performing the mapping between the namespaces. Huang discloses *wherein the mapping is defined in an extensible markup language style-sheet translation document* (column 7, lines 20-67, wherein the descriptors are represented using extensible markup language therefore it is inherent that the table used to perform the mapping between the namespace includes the use of XSLT with XML). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of a style-sheet translation document for representing the multimedia content descriptors. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a more standard representation of descriptors by using an extensible markup language. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Huang with Benitez and Vaithilingam for the

Art Unit: 2178

benefits of allowing the mapping of namespace descriptors in a standard and self-describing format using XML with style-sheets.

References to specific columns, figures or lines should not be limiting in any way. The entire reference provides disclosure related to the claimed invention.

Other Prior Art Cited

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Signes (U.S. 6,195, 088) discloses "Method And System For Controlling Multimedia Streams using Dynamic Prototypes"

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel

Patent Examiner

November 9, 2005


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER